

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claim 15 have been amended. Claims 1-28 are currently pending.

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the embedded hyperlinks in the Specification. Applicant has accordingly amended the Specification to delete the hyperlinks.

The Examiner also suggested that Applicant capitalize trademarks in the Specification and accompany the trademarks with generic terminology. Applicant has capitalized trademarks as suggested by the Examiner. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the trademarks (MICROSOFT, LASERJET, PENTIUM, PALM) are well-known trademarks that need not be accompanied by generic terminology. MPEP § 608.01(v) states:

However, if the product to which the trademark refers is set forth in such language that its identity is clear, the examiners are authorized to permit the use of the trademark if it is distinguished from common descriptive nouns by capitalization. If the trademark has a fixed and definite meaning, it constitutes sufficient identification unless some physical or chemical characteristic of the article or material is involved in the invention. In that event, as also in those cases where the trademark has no fixed and definite meaning, identification by scientific or other explanatory language is necessary. *In re Gebauer-Fuelnegg*, 121 F.2d 505, 50 USPQ 125 (CCPA 1941).

Applicant respectfully submits that the trademarks (MICROSOFT, LASERJET, PENTIUM, PALM) have fixed and definite meanings and do not require explanatory language.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-2, 6, 8-9

Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 6, and 8-9 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,239,837 to Yamada et al. in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0054212 to Fukuoka.

Claim 1 recites:

A method facilitating transfer of information from a data capture device to a host device, the method comprising:
upon connection of a data capture device to a host device that is capable of communicating with said data capture device, automatically verifying that a connection has been established between said data capture device and said host device and automatically initiating a transfer of information from said data capture device;
automatically providing notification that said transfer of information is in process; and
automatically providing notification of successful completion of said transfer of information.

(Emphasis Added). Yamada and Fukuoka, either individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest automatically initiating a transfer of information from the data capture device.

Yamada discloses a digital camera, which can copy image data to a detachable auxiliary memory connected to the camera. A user places the digital camera in a copy mode to initiate transfer of information from the camera to the detachable auxiliary memory by pushing a mode switch (to change the camera's operation mode to "copy") and a select switch (to select the "copy" mode). Alternatively, the camera goes into copying mode when the user pushes the select switch without pushing the mode switch. Thus, Yamada discloses that the camera goes into copy mode only when the user pushes either a mode switch and a select switch, or a select switch and mode switch.

Yamada does not teach or suggest automatically initiating a transfer of information from the data capture device.

Fukuoka discloses a digital electronic camera, which can accept various types of input/output cards, which connect the camera to an external processor. The connection enables transfer of information such as image signals, audio signals, information describing the status of the camera, and control commands between the camera and the external processor. Fukuoka does not teach or suggest automatically initiating a transfer of information from the data capture device.

As neither Yamada nor Fukuoka teaches or suggests automatically initiating a transfer of information from the data capture device, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2, 6, and 8-9 cannot be deemed obvious over the combination.

Claims 15, 18, 21, 22, 25

Examiner rejected claims 15, 18, 21-22, and 25 as being unpatentable over Yamada in view of Fukuoka.

Claim 15 recites:

A method facilitating transfer of information from a first device to a second device capable of communicating with said first device, the method comprising:

upon connection of a first device to a second device, automatically providing notification of the establishment of connectivity between said first device and said second device, and enabling automatic initiation of a transfer of information from said first device to said second device;

upon initiation of a transfer of information from said first device to said second device, automatically providing feedback while said transfer of information is in process; and

automatically providing notification of completion of said transfer of information.

(Emphasis Added). As discussed above, Yamada and Fukuoka, either individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest enabling automatic initiation of a transfer of information from said first device, as recited in claim 15. Thus, claim 15 and dependent claims 18, 21-22, and 25 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamada in view of Fukuoka.

Claims 3-5, 7, 10-14

Examiner rejected claims 3-5, 7 and 10-14 as being unpatentable over Yamada in view of Fukuoka and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,630,954 to Okada.

Okada discloses erasing an image file in an electronic camera and changing a state of notification to the user in accordance with data attached to the image file indicating whether the image file previously has been stored elsewhere. Okada does not teach or suggest enabling automatic initiation of a transfer of information from said first device to said second device, as recited in claim 1.

As none of Yamada, Fukuoka and Okada teach or suggest enabling automatic initiation of a transfer of information from said data capture device, as recited in claim 1, claims 3-5, 7 and 10-14, which depend from claim 1, are not obvious over the combination.

Claims 16-17, 19-20, 23-24, and 26-28

Examiner rejected claims 16-17, 19-20, 23-24, and 26-28 as being unpatentable over Yamada in view of Fukuoka and further in view of Okada.

As none of Yamada, Fukuoka and Okada teach or suggest enabling automatic initiation of a transfer of information from said first device, as recited in claim 15, claims 16-17, 19-20, 23-24, and 26-28, which depend from claim 15, are not obvious over the combination.

SUMMARY


Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments and discussion set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, the present and amended claims should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Judith Szepesi at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges/credits, please charge/credit our deposit account no. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: May 25, 2005



Judith A. Szepesi
Reg. No. 39,393

Customer No. 08791
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 720-8300